Reply of Government.—The cases of patels and shanbhogs are not identical. In the case of patels the office is chiefly sought for on account of the honour it confers and they should not therefore attach much importance to the potgi. There seems to be some hardship to shanbhogs under the existing rules. The Revenue Commissioner and the Superintendent of Survey will be requested to consider the question as to how the hardship complained of, *viz.*, that according to the existing rules several shanbhogs do not receive adequate remuneration, may be removed and submit proposals to Government.

SUBJECT NO. 82.

Joint hakdar patels and shanbhogs to be permitted to work by rotation.

Mr. B. Sitaramaiya, Chikmagalur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—When there is more than one registered hakdar patel and shanbhog for the same office, they should be allowed to do the duties by rotation.

Reply of Government.—In passing the Village Offices Regulation, this has been finally decided to be inexpedient and the question cannot be reconsidered.

SUBJECT NO. 83.

A single patel for the entire achkat of a tank.

Mr. Huchiregowda, Gubbi Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—There should be one patel only for the entire garden, wet or *neersardi* lands under a tank without regard to the question whether they belong to one and the same village or to different villages; and all maps should be rectified accordingly.

Under the existing system, it is not the patel who is entrusted with the maintenance of the headworks and the distribution of water that is entitled to have the water rate on lands irrigated by the tank included in the revenue for the calculation of the potgi due to him, but the patel in whose village the lands on which the water rate is paid are situated has the water rate included in the revenue on which his potgi is calculated. The member spoke with special reference to the Kadaba-Amanikere in the Tumkur Taluk and represented how difficult it was to make a proper distribution of water and maintain the tank owing to there being a large number of patels responsible for it.

MR. RAMANUJA IYENGAR:—The proposal is impracticable. It will not only interfere with vested hereditary rights but in the case of tanks having a large revenue it will be impossible for one patel to discharge the duties satisfactorily. He will not also have sufficient influence to collect all the raiyats together when there is danger to the tank or get the maintenance work done. The difficulties brought to notice in the case of the Kadaba-Amanikere tank are due to factions in the villages.

Mr. M. Venkatramayya also spoke against the proposition.